

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated March 14, 2007.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, and 36 are pending. No claims have been amended, added, or canceled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, and 36 remain pending in the present application.

The specification as has been amended to correct typographical errors.

Claims 1, 13, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner states, "The claims amendments now state that the second server sends the transfer ticket, received by the client. However, the specifications and drawings teach that the first server sends the transfer ticket received by the client."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading of claims 1, 13, and 25. Claim 1 does not recite that the second server generates the transfer ticket. Instead, claim 1 recites that the transfer ticket is generated *from the first server to the client*. The second server is recited as *receiving the transfer ticket from the client*. Claim 1 is fully supported by the specification. Applicant's arguments also apply to claims 13 and 25.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-18, 12, 13, 15, 18, 20-22, 24, 25, 27-30 and 32-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levergood in view of the FileNet Functionality Sheet. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In a network environment where a client address that is apparent to a first server differs from the client address that is apparent to a second server, the invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 13, and 25, addresses the problem of restricting access in such an environment by the use of transfer tickets in combination with URL requests. In response to receiving a URL request from the client, the first server determines if the use of the client has been granted authorization to access the file. The first server generates the transfer ticket to the client that includes an identifier identifying the particular file on the second server if the user has been granted authorization access. The transfer ticket is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server. In response to receiving the transfer request from the client, the second server redirects the client back to itself with a URL ticket that is bound to the client address apparent to the second server. When the second server receives the URL ticket from the client, it verifies the URL ticket and returns the file. In this manner, it is ensured that only the client that was issued the URL ticket can use the URL ticket to access the file, even though the client address apparent to the first and second servers are different.

Levergood discloses a client request made with a URL from a web browser. A content server redirects the client to an authentication server. The authentication server interrogates the client and then issues an SID to a qualified client. A valid SID typically comprises a user identifier, an accessible domain, a key identifier, an expiration time, the IP address of the user computer, and a digital signature. The

authentication server then forwards a new request consisting of the original URL appended by the SID to the client in a Redirect. The modified request formed by a new URL is automatically forwarded by the client browser to the content server. When the content server receives a URL request accompanied by an SID, it logs the URL with the SID and the user IP address in a transaction log and proceeds to validate the SID. When the SID is so validated, the content server sends the requested document for display by the client's web browser. (Col. 3, lines 21 – 49)

Levergood, however, does not disclose a first server determining if a user of the client has been granted authorization to access a file, where a client address apparent to the first server differs from a client address apparent to the second server. Levergood merely teaches that the authentication server may be at a different host than the content server.

The Examiner points to col. 2, line 60 – col. 3, line 4 of Levergood. However, here, Levergood only states that the client does not necessarily know how its message reaches the server. At the same time, the server makes responses without ever knowing exactly who the client is or what its IP address is. There is only one server, the Internet server, that is described in this section. This is not a specific teaching of a network where a first and a second server are involved, where the client address apparent to the first server differs from a client address apparent to the second server.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Levergood does not specifically teach allowing a content originator to publish a file on a first server, or specifying user authorization for a particular file, or file replication. The Examiner cites FileNet Functionality Sheet (FileNet) as teaching this limitation. However, even if FileNet teaches this limitation as argued, the combination of Levergood and FileNet does not

specifically teach a network where the client address apparent to the first server differs from a client address apparent to the second server. Thus, there is no need in Levergood in view of FileNet for the claimed mechanism to facilitate file access in such a network. Levergood in view of FileNet therefore does not teach or suggest a transfer ticket that is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server and a URL ticket that is bound to the client address apparent to the second server.

For the above reasons, Levergood in view of FileNet does not teach or suggest: determining if a user of the client has been granted authorization to access a file from a first server, wherein a client address apparent to the first server differs from a client address apparent to the second server; generating a transfer ticket from the first server to the client, wherein the transfer ticket is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server; and in response to receiving the transfer ticket from the client by the second server, redirecting the client back to the second server with a URL ticket, wherein the URL ticket is bound to the client address apparent to the second server, in combination with the other elements, as recited in independent claims 1, 13, and 25.

The arguments above apply with full force and effect to the remaining dependent claims because they are based on allowable independent claims. Therefore, the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, and 36 are allowable over the cited references. Because the secondary references stand or fall with the primary references, claims are allowable because they are dependent upon the allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of the claims as

now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,  
STRATEGIC PATENT GROUP, P.C.

May 14, 2007  
Date

/Stephen G. Sullivan/  
Stephen G. Sullivan  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 38,329  
(650) 969-7474